

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

**Drawings**

As asserted in the previous response filed January 10, 2007, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner accept the formal drawings submitted on August 28, 2003.

**Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1-17 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 15 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1.

**Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-3 and 14-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,561,461 ("Landis") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0237100 ("Piotrowski"). Claims 2-3, 14, and 16-17 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 15. For the reasons set forth below, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

An exemplary embodiment of the claimed invention is shown in Figure 4 of the present specification. Figure 4 shows that when a remote controller (9) is operated by a user, a remote control reception portion (8) receives an input designating a channel for which scanning is desired (*e.g.*, when a user wants to know the time of a particular program and channel). Further, an MPU (4) accepts the input as an interrupt (6) and *abandons a currently executed task* (*e.g.*, cancels the execution of scanning of a different channel, or multiple channels) *to execute*

*the task requested from the input.* Said another way, the MPU cancels any tasks it was in the process of performing in order to provide the information requested by the new input from the user. Advantageously, the information desired for a particular channel may be displayed quicker, as opposed to a user having to wait for a tuner to complete scanning of current tasks before executing the newly requested task. (*see e.g.*, Figure 4 and accompanying text).

Turning to the rejection, to establish a prima facie case of obviousness...the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” *see* M.P.E.P. §2143. The Applicant respectfully asserts that the cited references do not teach or suggest all the limitations recited in independent claim 1.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “wherein when a desired channel is newly selected, said time information acquisition means *cancels the acquisition operation currently performed and performs a new acquisition operation* with respect to said desired channel that is newly selected.” The Applicant respectfully asserts that Landis and Piotrowski, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest at least the aforementioned limitation as required by independent claim 1.

Specifically, the Examiner admits “Landis fails to teach wherein when a desired channel is newly selected, said time information acquisition means cancels the acquisition operation currently performed and performs a new acquisition operation with respect to said desired channel that is newly selected,” Office Action mailed May 17, 2007, p. 3. Piotrowski also fails to show or suggest at least this limitation.

Rather, Piotrowsky is directed to displaying program related information in an unobtrusive manner. (*see e.g.*, Piotrowsky, Abstract). The displaying, upon which the Examiner relies, merely teaches that information needed for the display may be updated when a viewer changes a program channel. Office Action mailed on May 17, 2007, p. 3 and Piotrowsky,

[0048]. While the cited portion of Piotrowsky teaches updating the display of information, Piotrowsky is completely silent with respect to the time acquisition means canceling the acquisition operation currently being performed and performing a new acquisition operation with respect to a desired channel that is newly selected. In fact, the Examiner supports the above assertion on page 3 of the instant Office Action. Specifically, the Examiner only asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Landis' reception device to include updating the time information every time the user changes channels, as taught by Piotrowsky, and fails to assert that either of the cited references even teach canceling of a current acquisition operation to perform a new acquisition operation. Thus, Piotrowsky clearly fails to show or suggest at least a time information acquisition means that cancels a acquisition operation currently being performed and performs a new acquisition operation with respect to said desired channel that is newly selected.

Further, assuming *arguendo* that the Examiner intended to infer that one of ordinary skill in the art could interpret the updating of information taught by Piotrowsky as suggesting canceling of an acquisition operation to perform a new acquisition operation, the Applicant respectfully submits that such an assumption would be incorrect. As discussed previously, Piotrowsky is completely silent with respect to canceling of a current operation to perform a new operation. Said another way, Piotrowsky fails to disclose the method used to update display information. Accordingly, the updating of information cannot be reasonably construed to involve canceling of an acquisition operation and performing a new acquisition operation. Such an assertion would effectively read out the explicit requirements of independent claim 1 (*e.g.*, canceling current operations to perform a new requested operation).

In view of the above, Landis and Piotrowsky, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest all the limitations of independent claim 1. Thus,

independent claim 1 is patentable over Landis and Piotrowsky. Independent claim 15 contains at least the same patentable limitations as claim 1 and, thus, is also patentable over Landis and Piotrowsky. Dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landis in view of Piotrowski, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,907,323 (“Lawler”). Claims 4-13 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1. For the reasons set forth below, the rejection is respectfully traversed.


As discussed above, neither Landis and Piotrowsky, whether considered separately or in combination, show or suggest all the limitations of independent claim 1. Further, Lawler does not provide that which Landis and Piotrowsky lack with respect to claim 1. This is evidenced by the fact that Lawler is only relied upon to teach “selecting and designating a channel from a group allowing a corresponding broadcast signal to be received,” Office Action mailed May 17, 2007, p. 5. Lawler is directed to EPG information, (*see e.g.*, Lawler, Abstract). Lawler is completely silent with respect to canceling a current acquisition operation and performing a new acquisition operation. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is patentable over Landis, Piotrowsky, and Lawler, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependant claims 4-13 are patentable over Landis, Piotrowsky, and Lawler for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 17252/002001).

Dated: July 16, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By  #45,079  
Jonathan P. Osha THOMAS SCHERER  
Registration No.: 33,986  
OSHA · LIANG LLP  
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant